

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

**JOEL ENRIQUE RIVERA PALMA,**

**Petitioner,**

**v.**

**No. CV 15-0004 RB/LAM**

**RAY TERRY, Warden,**

**Respondent.**

**ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S PROPOSED FINDINGS  
AND RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION**

**THIS MATTER** is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Lourdes A. Martínez’ *Proposed Findings and Recommended Disposition* (Doc. 21) (hereinafter “PF&RD”), entered on June 30, 2015. No party has filed objections to the proposed findings and recommended disposition and the deadline for filing objections has passed.<sup>1</sup> The Court has determined that it will: adopt the *Proposed Findings and Recommended Disposition* (Doc. 21); grant the *Government’s Motion to Dismiss a Petition for a Writ of Habeas Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241* (Doc. 20); dismiss without prejudice Petitioner’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition [Doc. 1]; and dismiss this case.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the *Proposed Findings and Recommended Disposition* (Doc. 21) are **ADOPTED** by the Court.

---


<sup>1</sup> The Court notes that the PF&RD was returned to the Court with “Return to Sender, Attempted - Not Known, Unable to Forward” stamped on the envelope that was sent to the Court. [Doc. 22]. It thus appears that Petitioner has failed to comply with the Court’s local rule requiring all parties, including parties appearing *pro se*, to notify the Clerk in writing of any change in their mailing address. See D.N.M. LR-Civ. 83.6.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the *Government's Motion to Dismiss a Petition for a Writ of Habeas Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241* (Doc. 20) is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Petitioner's 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition [Doc. 1] is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this case be **DISMISSED** and that a final judgment be entered concurrently with this order.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**HONORABLE ROBERT C. BRACK**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**